

A SCHOLASTICALL
DISCOURSE,

Demonstrating this Conclusion,
That (admitting *Erastus Senior's* Reasons
for true) neither the Pope, nor those cal-
led Bishops in the Church of *Rome*,
are Bishops either in *Order* or *Jurisdiction*.

Wherein is answered
All which is alledged by *Erastus Senior* against
the *Order* and *Jurisdiction* of the Bishops of
the Church of ENGLAND.

ALSO
A Defence of the *Order* and *Jurisdiction* of the Bishops
in the Church of ENGLAND.

By R. C. ? R. Corbet

L O N D O N,
Printed by J. G. for R. Royston, Bookseller to
His most SACRED MAJESTY. 1663.

A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.

DISCOUNT

For the purpose of the Commission
of the Court of the County of
the State of New York
in the County of the City of New York
in the County of the City of New York
in the County of the City of New York

Attest my hand and seal
this 10th day of June 1880
at the City of New York
in the County of the City of New York
in the County of the City of New York

A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.
A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.
A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.

1880

A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.
A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.
A. J. H. A. J. H. A. J. H.

PREFACE to the READER.



Men in avoiding Scylla usually fall upon Charybdis. But the Nation is wiser, I hope, having avoided the Irreligion & Profaneness of the late times, then now to run into Popery; although many fear there is more then an ordinary designe tending thereunto. To facilitate which, is newly crept abroad a Champion of the Roman-Catholic Cause, under the title of Erastus Senior, who in charity to others, will not allow so much charity to our Bishops in the Church of England, as to be so much as Legal. But if his zeal the Roman Cause, or charity to other men, hath so far dilated his reasons, that they conclude as much against the Pope and Bishops in the Church of Rome, as he intended them against ours in the Church of England; he shall have no great cause to triumph, nor his Church much reason to thank him, in that he has made himself and Church as very Heathens, as he designed us of the Church of England.

.....

Imprimatur.

Nov. 27.
1662.

*M. Franck S.T.P. R.D.
Ep. Lond. à Sac. Dom.*

.....



C H A P. I.

Proving from Erastus Senior's Reasons, that neither those called Bishops in the Church of Rome, nor the Pope himself, are Bishops Ordine.

O the perfection of all powers, whether Spiritual, Natural, or Legal, these two things are necessary, *Jus & Exercitium*: these, I think, *Erastus Senior* calls *Order*, and *Jurisdiction* or *Office*; the former may be without the latter, nay it must be afore the latter can be. Therefore a King must be by right or order, before he can rightfully exercise any Regal Authority or Power; so must a Bishop or Priest be by right or order, before he can justly exercise any Episcopal or Sacerdotal Jurisdiction; and so Parents, Husbands, Magistrates, and
Ma-

Masters of Families are endued with a right or power, before they can exercise any Jurisdiction over their Children, Wives, Fellow-subjects, or Servants. That Kings, Husbands, and Parents are endued with a right or power from the Law of Nature, and Magistrates and Masters of Families from the Municipal Lawes of every place where they do exercise them, hath been asserted by us elsewhere. That Episcopal Order or right is a Divine Institution, and founded by our Saviour, and not by Nature, or any Temporal or Civil Sanction, is affirmed as well by *Erastus Senior*, as us of the *Church of England* in the 9. chap. A Bishop then *Ordine*, or by Right, is he who is so made, or ordained by such form and means as our Saviour hath instituted, and by no other; unless *Erastus Senior* will grant another a Divine Power, which is Blasphemy. A Bishop *Jurisdictione*, or by Office, we will call him who is possess'd of a Bishoprick. So that *Erastus* and I will not differ who is a Bishop *Ordine*, and who *Jurisdictione*.

Ours in the Church of *England* are no Bishops *Ordine*, *Erastus Senior* sayes, because the form of Ordination wants fit words to signifye

he the Order given. The words are these; *Take thou the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the Grace of God which is in thee by Imposition of Hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.* If this form be insufficient to the Ordination of Bishops in the Church of *England*, then were not the Apostles Bishops by order; for our Saviour used no other in their Ordination. Nor were they made Bishops by these or any other Sacramental words (with much confidence, and no reason) *Erastus Senior* c. 3. p. 10. sayes, but onely *S. Peter*, and that by these words (*Pasce oves meas.*)

What? were none of the Apostles Bishops but onely *S. Peter*? how then, I pray, came the Colledge of Apostles (not Saint *Peter*) to chuse *S. Matthias* to the Bishoprick of *Judas*, (*τὸν ἀντικεινὸν*) if *Judas* had no Episcopal right Acts 1. 20. or order? how came all the Apostles (not *S. Peter*) to ordain *S. Stephen*, and six other Deacons? and how is it that *S. Paul* and *Barnabas*, and not *S. Peter*, did ordain Elders in every Church; which without all contradiction were acts of Episcopal power? Nay, can any man believe, that when *S. Philip* the Deacon Acts 8. had

had converted and baptized *Samaria*, and given notice thereof to the Colledge of Apostles at *Jerusalem*, that they, being inferiour Apostles, should upon Canonical Record send their superiour, and only Bishop among them, (*viz.* S. *Peter*) to administer their Decrees, and joyn S. *John* in equal power with him? for, sayes the Text, *They sent Peter and John to confirm them; and they laid their hands upon them, and they received the holy Ghost:* or that S. *Paul* should publicly withstand S. *Peter* to his face, in that wherein he was to be blamed, if he had been any wayes inferiour to him either in Order or Power? for however men may privately advise their Superiours, yet no man can without Arrogance and contempt of Authority publicly withstand his Superiour. Nor had alwayes S. *Peter* the precedency of name with the other Apostles;

Gal. 1.9:

* The
Lords brother,
B. B.
of *Jerusalem*.

for we read of *James*, *Cephas* and *John*, which seemed, &c. Nay, S. * *James*, though none of the twelve Apostles, did preside in the Council of *Jerusalem*, although Saint *Peter* and the other Apostles were members of it.

Well, but if the form by which our Saviour did ordain the Apostles, did not give them Episcopal

scopal order, as *Erastus Senior* sayes, let us see whether upon his own grounds (*Pasce oves meas*) could endue *S. Peter* with it. I say it could not.

For if the form by which our Saviour did ordain his Apostles, which was a form of Ordination, viz. *Receive the holy Ghost, &c.* were p. 2. insufficient to confer Episcopal Order for want of fit words to signifie it, as he sayes; then much less can *Pasce oves meas* (which not onely do not signifie the order given, but are no form of Ordination at all, but onely imperative, and refer to Jurisdiction) confer any upon *S. Peter*. If our Saviour had ordained *S. Peter* in this sense, it must have been by these or like words, *Accipe potestatem pascendi oves meas*: and that this is not my single sense, but of *Erastus Senior*, he sayes, the exhortation to the Bishop consecrated, to behave himself as a good Pastor, does not give this Order: and I pray what is the difference between *I exhort thee to be a Pastor*, and *Feed my sheep*? He sayes moreover, *Be thou a faithfull* c. 2. p. 9. *dispenser of the word of God, and his holy Sacraments, do not give any power to this or any other Sacrament, but onely to dispense them; Now to dispense a Sacra-*

ment is not to consecrate it, for it must be consecrated before it can be dispensed: by like reason cannot *Pasce oves meas* give any Episcopal Order to S. Peter; for to command to feed is not to consecrate; and S. Peter must have a power to feed, before he can be commanded to feed my sheep. Again he sayes, *be thou a faithfull dispenser*, &c. give no power, &c. and have thou authority, &c. give no power of Order, but of Jurisdiction; and therefore *Pasce oves meas* give none, for they onely command, and refer to Jurisdiction, not Order or Consecration. The Pope therefore, nor any Bishop in the Church of Rome, are Bishops *Ordine* from *Pasce oves meas*, nor from the form by which our Saviour ordained the Apostles (he sayes;) and therefore no Bishops *Ordine*, which was the thing propounded.

Well, but suppose *Pasce oves meas* did endue S. Peter with Episcopal Order, yet cannot the Pope, nor any Bishop in the Church of Rome, from hence derive it; for being a Divine Institution, it cannot be conferred or ordained, but by such means as God did institute and ordain it: but neither the Pope nor any Bishops in the Church of Rome are consecrated

or ordained by this form, and therefore are not Bishops *Ordine* by virtue of it. So then take (*Pasce oves meas*) to be essential, or not essential to the conferring of Episcopal Order; yet hence cannot the Pope, nor any Bishops in the Church of *Rome*, derive any Episcopal Order.

C H A P. II.

Afferting the Order of Bishops in the Church of England.

BUt though *Erastus Senior*, out of his charity to others, hath argued himself and party into a Heathenish state, and reduced them into the same condition he intended us of the *Church of England* in his Preface; yet will not I grant the form used in the Church of *England* to be insufficient for the consecrating of Bishops, or giving Episcopal Order: for since it is evident the Apostles did exercise this Order or Power, yet were endued with it by no other form then that used in our Church; how much better is it to apply this form, being instituted by our Saviour, to one

presented to the Consecrators as a Bishop elect, and after examination and prayers as for a Bishop elect, and as called to the office of a Bishop, and after Consecration, to exhort him as a Pastor or Bishop, then to alter it into any other, thereby making it doubtfull whether it be done or not? as if any Creature were wiser then God, and would dare to mend what God has made. But certainly it is most abominably done of *Erastus Senior*, equivocally and cantingly to deny this form of our Saviour, used in his Church as well as ours, to be any essential part of their form (which I believe no ingenuous man besides himself in his Church will doe:) and to affirm that the prayers of *Propitiare, Domine* &c. anciently called the *Benediction*, and used ever since *S. Peter's* time in their Consecration, *Physicè, non moralitèr loquendo*, and no wayes essential to the Consecration, but of later time altered by his Church, should give that which onely God could do; unless he will make himself or Church equal to God, to abrogate; or make what God has made a vain thing, and set up what himself and his party think fit above it, or instead of it. If there be any defect

fect in our Ordination, *Erastus* with much more ingenuity might have charged it upon our Saviour for instituting it, then upon our Church for imitating it.

C H A P. III.

Proving that neither the Pope, nor any Bishop in the Church of Rome, granting Erastus Senior's Reasons for true, are Bishops Jurisdictione.

E*Erastus Senior* sayes, none can give a Jurisdiction which he hath not: hence, he sayes, it is, that no number of Bishops can validly confirm or consecrate the Bishop of any Diocese, but the Metropolitan of the Province must be one, nor the Metropolitan of a Province, but the Primate of a Nation; nor the Primate of a Nation, but the Patriarch of that part of the World (or some person having faculty from him :) and in the next page he sayes, the Bishop of Rome is Patriarch of the West, and the undoubted rightfull Metropolitan to the Primate of this Nation; and therefore no Bishop can validly confirm or consecrate the Primate of this Nation, but the Bishop of Rome. If

If it be true which *Erastus Senior* sayes, that none can give a Jurisdiction which he hath not, then if he cannot shew, in the intervals of the Papacy, some who may give this supreme Patriarchal power, or Headship of the Church, to the Pope, then can neither the Pope have it, nor any Primate, Metropolitan, or Bishop derive any Jurisdiction from him; and by consequence neither the Pope, nor any Bishop in the Church of *Rome*, are Bishops Jurisdictione.

I say, it is impossible any such Primacy, as is pretended by *Erastus Senior*, can be in the Pope: for admitting that our Saviour did endue *S. Peter* with a Primacy above the other Apostles, and that he was Bishop of *Rome*, and the Popes his rightful Successors, yet cannot this Primacy be transferred to any of them; for *Extraordinaria potestas non transit in Successorem*. After *S. Peter's* death, none of the Apostles having this Primacy could give it to another; for, as *Erastus* sayes, *None can give a Jurisdiction to another which he hath not*. The Pope of *Rome* therefore not having this Primacy, no Primate of a Nation can receive Jurisdiction from him, nor the Metropolitan any

any from the Primate, nor any Bishop from the Metropolitane; and therefore from *Erastus Senior's* Reasons, neither the Pope, nor any Bishop in the Church of *Rome*, are Bishops *Jurisdictione*.

Although at first I designed no more then, to shew from *Erastus Senior's* Reasons, there is neither Order nor Jurisdiction in the Church of *Rome*, and to assert the Order and Jurisdiction of our Bishops in the Church of *England*; yet cannot I but take notice how ignorantly (I will say no more) he affirms Bishops to be consecrated to their Bishopricks, and that the Pope was Founder of the See of *Canterbury*.

For no Bishop is consecrated into his Bishoprick, but invested or installed; and originally Bishopricks with us in *England* were donative, *per traditionem baculi* (i.e.) the Crozier, which was the Pastoral staff, & annuli, the Ring, whereby he was married to the Church: and therefore if the meanest Bishop of Jurisdiction in the world be elected to the Papacy, he is no more consecrated; nay though he be one *sine titulo*, yet he is never more consecrated, though made Primate, Patriarch, or Pope.

Well,

*Coke com.
Lit. 344.
Sess. 648.*

Well, let us see whether the Pope were Founder of the See of Canterbury, as *Erastus* so vainly, and without any authority or reason affirmeth. That *S. Paul* did preach the Gospel here in *England*, is affirmed by *Theod. l. 9. de curandis Græcorum affectibus*. *Paulum è priori captivitate, Roma dimissum, Britannis & aliis in occidente Evangelium prædicasse*; and *Nicephorus* sayes that *Simon Zelotes doctrinam Evangelii ad Occidentalem Oceanum Insulasq; Britannicas perferet*. But I do no where find, that ever any Christian Church was planted and endowed in any part of *Britain*, now called *England*, before King *Lucius* his time, (which *Beda* sayes was Anno Christi 156. and in the Reigns of *Marcus Aurelius* and *Lucius Verus*, (yet in the year 156. *Antoninus Pius* reigned, and until 160.) when *Pla:* sayes the 25 *Flamens*, * whereof three were Arch-*Flamens*, were converted into Bishopricks and Arch-bishopricks; some say the chief and Metropolitan of all was the Arch-bishoprick of *London*. I speak this to shew (if this were so) how the Primacy came to be founded in *Canterbury*, and by whom.

After the English Saxons had not onely driven

Lib. 1. c.
40.

Lib. 1. c. 4.

In vita
Sancti
Eluth p.

20, 21.
* In London,
York,
and Carlisle.

driven the ancient *Britans* out of that part of Britain now called *England*, some into that part of France called *Britannia Arémorica*, others into *Wales*, (where Christianity continued, when the English Saxons were converted) but also the free exercise of Christianity; they continued Pagan till their conversion by *S. Austin* and *Miletus*, sent by *S. Gregory* the Great.

But though *Austine* was sent by the Pope, yet did he not upon that mission presume to enter King *Ethelbert's* Dominions without leave; but in the Isle of *Thanet* gave the King an account of his Embassie, who commanded him and his followers to remain in the Isle, and provided them necessaries, till he should see convenient how further to dispose of them. After *Austin* had declared his message, he received leave of the King, and went to preach in *Kent*, where the King gave him and his followers dwellings in *Canterbury*, which was the Metropolis of his Empire, and also leave to preach. *Bed. Eccles. Hist. Gent. Ang. cap. 25.* Afterward, before he was made a Bishop, or had given any account to the Pope, or received any message from him, *cap. 26.* the Content sayes, *Ut idem (viz. Augustinus)*

*nus) in Cantio primitiva Ecclesie & doctrinam se
imitatus & vitā, atq; in urbe Regis sedē Episcopatus
acceperit.* How the same man (*viz. Austin*) in
Kent imitated the doctrine and life of the
Primitive Church, and received his Episcopal
See in the City of the King. And the Chap.
says, *Austin* and those joyned with him, upon
the King's conversion to the Faith, in all
things received a greater liberty to preach,
and to build and restore Churches. And at the
end says, *Neither did the King delay, but gave
to his Teachers in the Metropolis of Canterbury a
See, or place of Seat, agreeable to their degree, and al-
so conferred upon it necessary provisions of divers
kinds; Nec distulit, quin etiam Doctoribus suis lo-
cum Sedis, eorum gradui congruum, in Doroverniā
Metropoli suā donaret, simul & necessarias in diver-
sis speciebus possessiones conferret.* And it is in the
27. chap. where *Beda* relates how he went in-
to France to *Arles*, and there was ordained by
Etherius Arch-bishop of that City, Arch-bi-
shop: and after he returned into England,
he presently sent to Rome *Laurence* the Priest,
and *Peter* the Monk, who should give an ac-
count to the holy Bishop *Gregory*, how the
Nation of England had received the Faith, and
how he was made a Bishop. Chap.

C H A P. IV.

Shewing the Bishops in the Church of England are Bishops Jurisdictione, viz. are rightfully invested and installed in their Bishopricks, and regularly may exercise in their Dioceses any Episcopal Act.

I Will not dispute the power of God in his miraculous propagating of *Christianity* by the means of poor men, and by setting of Dissention and Discord in the World, all temporal powers contradicting it: nor is it reasonable for any man to imagine, that after Christian Faith and Religion is received and planted in any place, that there men should expect that God would continue it by miracle, but that they ought to use what means they can to support them: nor can *Erastus Senior* by a Bishop *Jurisdictione*, as of London, or *Canterbury*, mean this, but of a planted Christian Church, where the State, as well as Church, is Christian.

We, *Erastus* and my self, both agree, that the Order of Bishops is a Divine Institution, and therefore it cannot *suscipere magis aut mi-*

nus, because no less power then that which made a thing can alter it; and being a Divine Institution, all Episcopal Acts are done, and never to be undone, in one place as much as another: and therefore wheresoever any Bishop does confirm a man, ordain a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or consecrate any place to the worship and service of God, these Acts are not onely done, but are indeleble characters, and can never be wiped out. But what power that is which founds and confines Bishopricks, and qualifies men so, as none but such men can regularly exercise any Episcopal Act in such limits or precincts, is now to be enquired into.

First then, I answer negatively, the endowments and limits of a Bishoprick are not in Spiritual Jurisdiction or cognisance, for nothing is purely Spiritual but what is derived from our Saviour, either immediately, or mediately: but the limits and endowments of Bishopricks are temporal things; and our

Joh. 18. 36 Saviour sayes, *My Kingdome is not of this world;*

Joh. 3. 17. and, *God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world, but that by him he might save the world; and,*

Lu. 12. 14. *O man, who made me a Judge, or Divider among you?*

you? Nor can it ever be shewed wherein Christianity does in any respect detract from the Regality of Princes, or temporal Powers. And as under the Gospel, so under the old Law, though the Priesthood were a Divine Institution, yet were the Priests subject to the temporal Powers, and their Cities assigned by temporal Powers. *Moses was in the* Exo. 4. 16.
stead of God to Aaron; and the children of Israel gave by lot unto the Levites these Cities with their Josh. 21. 8.
Suburbs, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses. Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, &c. and Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their Queens thy nursing mothers, says the Prophet *Isaiah.* Yet never Isa. 49. 22. 23.
 after was there any King of Judah, but Idolaters; and the Children of Israel were then carried into so strange a captivity, that to this day is unknown what became of them. This Prophecy then has reference to Christian Kings, & in them it is fulfilled. Christian Kings therefore may, and ought to nurse and indulge God's Church. And if Sacrilege be a sin, then is Oblation to God a vertue. *Quod datum est Ecclesie, datum est Deo.* By our Lawes all Arch-bishopricks and Bishopricks within the

the Realm of *England*, have been founded by the Kings of *England*, and do hold of the King by Barony, and have been all called by Writ to the Court of Parliament, and are Lords of Parliament; as (among many) take one nota-

Rot. 18.
H. 3.

ble Record : *Mandatum est omnibus Episcopis, qui conventuri sunt apud Glocestriam, die Sabbati in crastin. Sanctæ Katherine, firmiter inhibendo, quòd si cut Baronias suas, quas de Rege tenent, diligunt, nullo modo presumant consilium tenere de aliquibus quæ ad Coronam Regis pertinent, vel quæ Personam Regis, vel statum suum, vel statum Concilii sui contingunt; scituri pro certo, quòd si fecerint, Rex indè se capiet ad Baronias suas. Teste*

Coke Com.
Lit. p. 97.

Rege apud Hereford. 23. Novemb. &c. And see Com. Lit. 344. At first all Bishopricks in England were of the King's foundation, and donation, per traditionem baculi & annuli. King Henry the first being requested to make them elective, refused it: but King John by his Charter bearing date Quinto Julii, Anno decimo septimo, granted that the Bishopricks should be eligible. So that at first all Bishopricks were not onely of the King's foundation and donation, but persons to them are eligible from no other cause but the King's Charter. Since there-

therefore by God's Precept Kings ought to be *nursing Fathers* to Christ's Church, and since all Bishopricks are of the King's foundation, and since the persons of all the King's Subjects are in his dominion and power, or otherwise every soul should not be subject to Higher Powers; it will certainly follow, Bishops rightfully invested and installed in their Bishopricks from the King, may regularly exercise any Episcopal Act in their Diocese, and none but such, without apparent disobedience and contempt of the Laws of the King, to which they ought to be subject.

C H A P. V.

Answering the Reasons alledged by Erastus against the Jurisdiction of the Bishops of the Church of England.

ALthough *Erastus Senior* in the first Chap. would distinguish between a Bishop *Ordine* and *Jurisdictione*, yet in the 9. chap. he does so confound different things, as it is impossible, without further explaining them, to shew wherein *Erastus* begs the question, and wherein he is mistaken.

Things

Things which pertain to the Church are two-fold: either as they are in themselves purely and simply spiritual in their Essence; or as they accidentally have reference to the Church, and in themselves are not purely and simply spiritual: for example, Blasphemy, Apostasie from Christianity, Heresie, Schisme, Holy Orders, Admissions of Clerks, Celebration of Divine Service, Rights of Matrimony, Divorces, generall Bastardy, Substraction and right of Tithes, Oblations, Obventions, Dilapidations, Excommunication, Reparation of Church, Probate of Testaments, Administrations, and Accounts upon the same, Simonie, Incests, Fornication, Adultery, Solicitation of Chastity, Pensions, Procurations, Appeals in Ecclesiastical cases, Commutation of Penance, are determined here with us by Ecclesiastical Judges.

So that there is a mix'd Conusance, or Ecclesiastical Judicature, viz. of things purely spiritual, by which Ecclesiastical Judges are empowered to determine, and that by no Humane Power, but only as they are empowered by our Saviour, and are his Ministers, viz. of Or-

Ordination, Consecration, Excommunication, Heresie, &c. and this power the Church and Ecclesiastical persons had, before ever temporall Powers received the Gospel of Christ, or were converted to Christianity. But after it pleased God Kings were converted to Christianity (I do not read, nor ever heard of a State or Common-wealth that ever was) then did Kings cherish and defend God's Church, and endued it with many privileges and immunities, which erewhile was persecuted by them. It is true, no question, but that originally all Bishopricks their bounds, and the Division of Parishes and their Endowments, the consueance of Tithes, the Probation of Wills, the granting Letters of Administration and Accounts upon the same, the Right of Institution and Induction, and Erection of all Ecclesiastical Courts, &c. were of the Kings foundation and donation; also to him by all divine and humane Lawes belongs the care and preservation of all his Subjects in all cases, none excepted. And therefore not onely all those things which relate to the extern peace and quiet of the Church, although exercised by

D,

Eccle-

Ecclesiastical persons; but all those privileges and immunities which the Church and Church-men have in a Church planted, which the Apostles and primitive Christians, in a Church planting, had not, are all originally grants of Kings and supreme Powers.

So that to the Installment of a Bishop in an endowed Bishoprick divers things are necessary: viz. That he be a Priest rightly and truly ordained, and consecrated a Bishop, and this is a pure spiritual act: but that he is elected to the Bishoprick, confirmed, invested & installed in it, are no spiritual acts, but founded in the King; however it may be they are executed by Ecclesiastical persons. *Erastus* Senior now confounding the creation and institution of a Pastor, (whereas they are different, for to create or consecrate a Pastor is a power of the Keyes, but to institute him into a Bishoprick is a power of the King's) in the same thing, not onely begs a false question, in making it a power of the Keyes, but also falsely infers, that the King cannot institute a Pastor to a See or Bishoprick, which is purely and solely in him. And therefore Queen *Elizabeth* might assign, constitute and con-

confirm *Matthew Parker* to the See of *Canterbury*, nor could any but she do it. If she were the rightful Queen of *England*, which *Erastus* does not deny, What needs *Erastus Senior* now take such pains to prove ten whole Pages together, that our Bishops had no right to be confirmed, constituted, and assigned to their Bishopricks but from the King, which none will deny him?

I cannot but take notice how *Erastus* having confounded Consecration here with Institution, makes confirming and consecrating of an Arch-bishop or Bishop to any See, the same thing, and purely spiritual: whereas to consecrate an Arch-bishop or Bishop is one thing, and purely spiritual; and to confirm an Arch-bishop or Bishop in his See is another, and temporal. P. 7.3

But I would advise *Erastus* to have a care lest he be not shent for affirming, that no Bishop *Ordine* can confirm or consecrate a Pastor; for the being seized of a Bishoprick does not validate or invalidate any spiritual Act of a Bishop, as to the essence of it: and if *Barlow* and *Scory's* being suspended the exercise of their Jurisdiction in their Bishop-

P. 42. ricks of *Bath* and *Chichester*, did invalidate their consecrating and confirming *Matthew Parker*, because they were not actual Bishops of Cathedral Churches, as *Erastus* sayes; then do I not see how any Act of *Vigilius* the first, when he was in exile, and *Rome* in the possession of *Totila*, could be valid. Nor could *Boniface* the Eighth, when he was taken prisoner by *Philip* the Fair, and *Rome* possessed by him; nor *Clement* 7. when *Charles* 5. had him prisoner, and possessed *Rome*, consecrate or confirm any Arch-bishop or Bishop; for without doubt they then were not actual Bishops of *Rome*.

P. 42. For *Erastus Senior's* Objection, that simple Bishops cannot give a Superiour or Metropolitan Jurisdiction, is nothing to the purpose, nor affirmed by us: for though the Order of Bishops be a Divine Institution, yet the extraordinary exercise of a Metropolitan in his Province (being no wise purely spiritual, but having onely reference to the extern peace of the Church) is not so, but from humane and temporary Laws.

I will not undertake to answer for all
 C. 9. p. 31: which is literally contained in the Oath of Supremacy,

premacý, or charged by *Erastus Senior* upon our Church-men taking it, neither is it much to our purpose. This I say, that Queen *Elizabeth* by her Proclamation, and after by her Injunctions, did declare, that she took nothing upon her more, then what anciently of right did belong to the Crown of *England*, viz. that she had supreme Power under God over all sorts of people within the Kingdome of *England*, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Lay persons, and that no Foraign power hath, or ought to have any Jurisdiction over them: and in this sense every man is allowed to take the Oath of Supremacy, and I hope *Erastus* will not deny his Sovereign this power. *

*Cam. Eliq.
Reg. 39. 40*

Nor will I undertake to answer for all the acts of Princes, whether they entrench upon the Power of the Keyes, or not: This I say, that if Kings do entrench upon this power, yet cannot this annihilate any act thereof, being rightfully done. And therefore admit King *Jame's* did authorizing other Bishops of his own, appointing them to doe all acts pertaining to the power and authority of the Archbishop of *Canterbury* in causes or matters Ecclesiastical, as amply, fully, and effectually to all

* See the Admonition to simple men in *Q. Eliq. Injunctions*, as they are set out with Dr. *Sparrow's Preface*, p. 78. C. 11. p. 32.

all intents and purposes, as the said Archbishop might have done, (which without all doubt the King might do;) and that the Declaration of his now Majesty (whom God grant long to reign over us) *touching affairs of Religion*, in which he deprives all the Archbishops and Bishops of this Land (*Erastus sayes*) of their power of sole ordaining and censuring their Presbyters, and joyns their Presbyters in Commission with them, as to the acts of Ordaining and Censuring, did entrench upon the Ghostly Power; yet could not this any wayes rescind the Order of any Priest or Bishop rightfully ordained and consecrated, but Priests and Bishops rightfully ordained and consecrated, are as much Priests and Bishops after such acts as before.

CONCLUSION.

Whether our Bishops be legal or not, conduces not to the Question, whether they be rightfully ordained; for the Order of Bishops being a Divine Institution, cannot *suscipere majus aut minus*, a Bishop rightly ordained is as much a Bishop, although all temporal powers did contradict it, as if they allowed it. It is loss of time, therefore, fore, to examine and cross-examine all the Statutes alledged by *Erastus*, whether they allow, or not allow, the Order of our Bishops. And now, let any man judge, whether *Erastus Senior* has any great reason to boast, in that his own Reasons have concluded the Pope and Bishop of Rome to be neither Bishops *Ordine*, nor *Jurisdictione*: Neither has he clearly alledged one right Reason against the Order or Jurisdiction of the Bishops in the Church of *England*; but onely lost much time in endeavouring to prove them no Legal Bishops, which to the essence of the Order of a Bishop is no wayes material.

THE END.